



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

10/755,836

01/12/2004

Zachary Mcrlynn Loafman

AUS920030789US1

9840

54105

7590

11/27/2006

DUKE W. YEE
YEE & ASSOCIATES, P.C.
P.O. BOX 802333
DALLAS, TX 75380

EXAMINER

LEWIS, ALICIA M

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2164

DATE MAILED: 11/27/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 10/755,836	Applicant(s) LOAFMAN ET AL.	
	Examiner Alicia M. Lewis	Art Unit 2164	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 27 September 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date: _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Information Disclosure Statement

1. The information disclosure statements (IDS) submitted on July 17, 2006 and November 8, 2006 are in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statements are being considered by the examiner.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

3. Claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Widell et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0055490 A1) ('Widell') in view of Lordi et al. (US Patent 5,857,204) ('Lordi').

With respect to claims 1, 8 and 16, Widell teaches:

a processor (paragraphs 31 and 59);

a set of instructions configured to run on said processor (paragraph 30), said set of instructions operable to:

change a first set of data for a first thread associated with a first file (paragraph 43 lines 4-6 and paragraphs 34, 36 and 39);

store said change for said first set of data (paragraphs 34, 36 and 39);

responsive to an operation error, retrieve said stored change for said first set of data (paragraphs 45 and 48); and

rollback said change to said first set of data to recover said first set of data for said first thread (paragraphs 45 and 48).

Although Widell teaches that many types of data structures may be used (which would include a file), he does not explicitly teach a file system having files.

Lordi teaches a method and system that applies transaction techniques to file system operations in non-database applications executing on parallel processing systems (see abstract), in which he teaches a file system having files (column 5 lines 1-7).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have modified Widell by the teaching of Lordi because a file system having files would enable a method and system that applies transaction techniques to file system operations in non-database applications executing on parallel processing systems, and reduce or eliminate manual restoration of file state when failures occur; therefore making Widell's invention more useful.

With respect to claims 2, 9 and 17, Widell as modified teaches wherein said set of instructions is further operable to:

change a second set of data for a second thread (Widell, paragraph 30 lines 8-12), said second thread associated with a second file (Widell, paragraph 43 lines 4-6) of said file system (Widell, paragraphs 34, 36 and 39);

store said change for said second set of data (Widell, paragraphs 34, 36 and 39);

responsive to an operation error, retrieve said stored change for said second set of data (Widell, paragraphs 45 and 48); and

rollback said change to said second set of data to recover said second set of data for said second thread (Widell, paragraphs 45 and 48).

With respect to claims 3, 10 and 18, Widell as modified teaches wherein the retrieve and rollback operations are responsive to a notification from said first thread (Widell, paragraph 45 lines 4-7, paragraph 48 lines 5-12).

With respect to claims 4, 11 and 19, Widell as modified teaches wherein said operation error comprises a file system error (Widell, paragraphs 5 and 33; Lordi, column 6 lines 3-11 and 66-67).

With respect to claims 5, 12 and 20, Widell teaches wherein said operation error comprises a thread operation error (Widell, paragraphs 5 and 33), and the stored change for said first set of data and the stored change for said second set of data are chained together (Widell, Figure 6, paragraph 46).

Art Unit: 2164

With respect to claim 13, Widell as modified teaches wherein said operation error comprises a multi-thread operation error (Widell, paragraphs 5 and 33).

4. Claims 6, 7, 14 and 15 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Widell et al. (US Patent Application Publication 2005/0055490 A1) ('Widell') in view of Lordi et al. (US Patent 5,857,204) ('Lordi'), as applied to claims 1-5, 8-13 and 16-20 above, and further in view of Carter et al. (US Patent 5,987,506) ('Carter').

With respect to claims 6 and 14, Widell as modified teaches claims 1 and 8.

Widell as modified does not teach wherein said first file comprises an inode page.

Carter teaches remote access and geographically distributed computers in a globally addressable storage environment (see abstract), in which he teaches wherein said first file comprises an inode page (column 30 lines 59-61).

It would have been obvious to a person having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have further modified Widell by the teaching of Carter because wherein said first file comprises an inode page would enable Widell's mechanisms to be implemented on a computer network system, having adaptable system configurations for dynamically exploiting distributed network resources and improved fault tolerance (Carter, column 2 lines 55-67).

With respect to claims 7 and 15, Widell as modified teaches wherein said second file comprises a directory page (Carter, column 30 lines 60-61).

Response to Arguments

5. Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1-20 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.
6. Applicant argues that examiner has failed to provide motivation for combining the references in rejecting claim 7. The examiner previously combined the Widell and Carter references in rejecting claim 6, and the motivation for doing so is stated in the 103 rejection. Because the same two references were used in rejecting claim 7, the examiner did not see the need to restate the motivation for combining the same two references, as it would be the same as used in the rejection of claim 6.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Alicia M. Lewis whose telephone number is 571-272-5599. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 9 - 6:30, alternate Friday off.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Charles Rones can be reached on 571-272-4085. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2164

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Alicia Lewis
November 13, 2006


SAM RIMELL
PRIMARY EXAMINER